

REMARKS

Claims 7-10 and 12-13 have been amended. Claims 7-13 are presently pending.

In view of such amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the claims, as presently presented, are respectfully requested.

EXAMINER'S ACTION

The 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, because the application states that it is an "indicator" that is moving a distance across the display of the cursor, where the distance is defined by the weighting of the character on which the cursor is located, while being advanced across the character.

Claim 7, and also claim 13, have been amended to clarify that (i) the cursor includes an indicator movable across the display of the cursor, and (ii) the indicator must be moved a distance across the display of the cursor to advance the cursor to another character, where the weighting on the character on which the cursor is displayed defines the distance. (See specification at page 8, first paragraph, and FIGs. 1 and 3).

Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 7-8 and 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mason in view of Comerford *et al.* In addition, claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Mason in view of Comerford *et al.*, and further in

view of Imaizumi *et al.* Independent claims 7 and 13, and claims 8-12 which depend from claim 7, clearly are patentable over the cited reference combinations.

Claim 7, as amended, is directed to a method for inputting text using a cursor, where the cursor is used to select a character from a character set for input as text. As required by claim 7, "the cursor includes an indicator movable across the display of the cursor" and characters of the character set are "weighted according to frequency statistics of character sequences". The method of claim 7 further requires that the selecting includes "moving the indicator a distance across the display of the cursor to advance the cursor" from a first character to an adjacent, second character, and that the weighting on the first character defines the distance. Advantageously, according to claim 7, the weighting on the character on which the cursor is displayed defines the distance that the indicator included within the cursor must be moved across the display of the cursor to advance the cursor to another character. For characters that have been determined to be less probable for input as text, the size of the display of the cursor on such characters is smaller, such that the indicator needs to travel a shorter distance to move across the display of the cursor. Thus, for characters where the display of the cursor is of a smaller size, the cursor can be advanced more quickly to the next character. (See specification, for example, at page 8, lines 1-12; page 9, lines 19-27; page 13, lines 17-18; and FIG. 3).

The Examiner admitted that Mason does not disclose weighting of characters of a character set, and "that the weighting defines a distance that cursor [*sic.*, indicator]" must move to advance the cursor across the character. Consequently, in contrast to

the claimed invention, in Mason the size of the display of the cursor is the same on all characters.

Although Comerford *et al.* describes optically emphasizing characters of a character set, such as by color, size, framing, etc., Comerford *et al.* does not cure the deficiencies of Mason with respect to the requirements of claim 7. In Comerford *et al.*, the spatial distance between characters, and the distance that a mouse pointer has to travel to advance between characters, remains the same. In addition, Comerford *et al.* automatically positions the mouse pointer close to an expected character, which contradicts the invention of claim 7 of dynamically adapting the distance that an indicator needs to travel across a display of a cursor on a character, based on the weighting on the character.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest moving an indicator within a cursor, across the display of the cursor, so as to advance the cursor to another character, where the size of the display of the cursor, and thus the distance that the indicator needs to be moved to advance the cursor, is based on the weighting on the character on which the cursor is displayed, as required by claim 7. One of skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Comerford *et al.* with Mason, because Comerford *et al.* concerns directly positioning a cursor in the absence of controlled movement of an indicator within a display of a cursor on a character to advance the cursor from the character to an adjacent character, as required by the claimed invention. Further, even if Mason and Comerford *et al.* were combined, despite the lack of any teaching, suggestion or motivation for such combination in either of the references, the resulting combination

would not provide for "advancing the cursor" across a first character to a second, adjacent character as part of selecting a character for input as text, as required by claim 7. None of the references in any combination weight characters according to frequency statistics, such that the distance that the indicator must move across the display of the cursor on a character depends upon the weighting of the character. Advantageously according to the claimed invention, the indicator can be moved more quickly across the display of a cursor for a character less probable for input as text, because the indicator needs to travel a shorter distance for such character, which in turn provides that the cursor can be more rapidly advanced to a character more probable for input as text.

Accordingly, claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Mason and Comerford *et al.*

In addition, independent claim 13, which has amended to include restrictions concerning movement of an indicator across a distance within the display of a cursor corresponding to those of amended independent claim 7, also is patentable over the combination of Mason and Comerford *et al.* for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 7.

Further, claims 8-12, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 7, are also patentable over the combination of Mason and Comerford *et al.* alone, or further in view of Imaizumi *et al.*, for the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 7 and because of the further restrictions they add.

As to claim 9, although Imaizumi *et al.* describes moving a cursor within a window existing on a display for controlling the size and position of the window on the display, there is no teaching or suggestion of controlling movement of a cursor across

adjacent characters by moving an indicator a distance across the display of the cursor, as required by claim 9.

Withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections is, therefore, respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all of the claims, as presently presented, are patentable.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if it is believed that further amendment and/or discussion would help to advance the prosecution of the present application.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 7-13 are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Davy E. Zoneraich
Registration Number 37,267

NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS
P.O. Box 1018
Somerville, New Jersey 08876-1018
Phone: (908) 722-0700
Fax: (908) 722-0755
E-Mail: ipdept@nmmlaw.com

Attorney Docket No: 101185-15US